arXiv:1607.07033v1 [math.LO] 24 Jul 2016

MORE NOTIONS OF FORCING ADD A SOUSLIN TREE

ARI MEIR BRODSKY AND ASSAF RINOT

Abstract. An $\aleph_1$-Souslin tree is a complicated combinatorial object whose existence cannot be decided on the grounds of ZFC alone. But 15 years after Tennenbaum and independently Jech devised notions of forcing for introducing such a tree, Shelah proved that already the simplest forcing notion — Cohen forcing — adds an $\aleph_1$-Souslin tree.

In this paper, we identify a rather large class of notions of forcing that, assuming a GCH-type assumption, add a λ^+-Souslin tree. This class includes Prikry, Magidor and Radin forcing.

1. Introduction

The definition of a κ-Souslin tree may be found in Section 2. Our starting point is a theorem of Jensen from his masterpiece [Jen72]. Let κ denote a regular uncountable cardinal, and let E denote a stationary subset of κ. The principle from [Jen72, p. 287], which we denote here by $\square(E)$, asserts the existence of a sequence $\langle C_\alpha \mid \alpha < \kappa\rangle$ such that for every limit ordinal $\alpha < \kappa$:

- C_α is a club in α;
- if $\bar\alpha$ is an accumulation point of C_α, then $C_\alpha \cap \bar\alpha = C_{\bar\alpha}$ and $\bar\alpha \notin E$.[1]

The principle from [Jen72, p. 293], commonly denoted $\diamondsuit(E)$, asserts the existence of a sequence $\langle Z_\alpha \mid \alpha < \kappa\rangle$ such that for every subset $Z \subseteq \kappa$, there exist stationarily many $\alpha \in E$ such that $Z \cap \alpha = Z_\alpha$. Jensen's theorem reads as follows:

Theorem 1.1 (Jensen, [Jen72, Theorem 6.2])**.** *If E is a stationary subset of a given regular uncountable cardinal κ, and $\square(E) + \diamondsuit(E)$ holds, then there exists a κ-Souslin tree.*

The goal of this paper is to identify various forcing scenarios that will introduce κ-Souslin trees. We do so by studying several combinatorial principles that can be used (together with $\diamondsuit(\kappa)$) to construct κ-Souslin trees, and establishing that some forcing scenarios already introduce these. The simplest among the combinatorial principles under consideration is the following:

Definition 1.2. For any regular uncountable cardinal κ, $\boxtimes^*(\kappa)$ asserts the existence of a sequence $\langle \mathcal{C}_\alpha \mid \alpha < \kappa\rangle$ such that:

(1) For every limit ordinal $\alpha < \kappa$:
   - $\mathcal{C}_\alpha$ is a nonempty collection of club subsets of α, with $|\mathcal{C}_\alpha| < \kappa$;
   - if $C \in \mathcal{C}_\alpha$ and $\bar\alpha$ is an accumulation point of C, then $C \cap \bar\alpha \in \mathcal{C}_{\bar\alpha}$;

(2) For every cofinal $A \subseteq \kappa$, there exist stationarily many $\alpha < \kappa$ such that $\sup(\mathrm{nacc}(C) \cap A) = \alpha$ for all $C \in \mathcal{C}_\alpha$.[2]

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 03E05; Secondary 03E35, 05C05.

Key words and phrases. Souslin-tree construction, microscopic approach, Prikry forcing, Magidor forcing, Radin forcing, parameterized proxy principle, square principle, outside guessing of clubs.

This research was supported by the Israel Science Foundation (grant #1630/14).

[1] Note that $\square(E)$ for $E = \kappa = \aleph_1$ is a trivial consequence of ZFC, and that $\square(E)$ for $\sup(E) = \kappa > \aleph_1$ implies that $E \neq \kappa$. Therefore, our choice of notation does not conflict with the principle $\square(\kappa)$ from [Tod87, p. 267].

[2] Here, $\mathrm{nacc}(C)$ stands for the set of non-accumulation points of C. See the *Notation* subsection below.

An evident difference between the principles $\square(E)$ and $\boxtimes^*(\kappa)$ is that the former assigns only a single club to each level α, whereas the latter assigns many (like in Jensen's *weak square* principle). A more substantial difference is that the principle $\square(E)$ implies that the stationary set E is non-reflecting, whereas the principle $\boxtimes^*(\kappa)$ is consistent with the statement that all stationary subsets of κ reflect (by [LH16], or by a combination of the main results of [FH16] and [Rin16]).

Nevertheless, $\boxtimes^*(\kappa)$ is a nontrivial principle. For instance, one can use the function ρ_2 from the theory of *walks on ordinals* [Tod87] to show that $\boxtimes^*(\kappa)$ entails the existence of a κ-Aronszajn tree. More importantly, we have the following:

Proposition A. *If κ is a regular uncountable cardinal, and $\boxtimes^*(\kappa)+\diamondsuit(\kappa)$ holds, then there exists a κ-Souslin tree.*

Now, there is an obvious way of introducing $\boxtimes^*(\kappa)$ by forcing. Conditions are sequences $\langle \mathcal{C}_\alpha \mid \alpha \leq \delta\rangle$ of successor length below κ, such that for every limit ordinal $\alpha \leq \delta$, the two bullets of Definition 1.2(1) hold. But is there another way?

The main result of this paper is the identification of a ceratin class of notions of forcing that (indirectly) introduce $\boxtimes^*(\kappa)$.

Definition 1.3. For a regular uncountable cardinal λ, let $\mathbb{C}_\lambda$ denote the class of all notions of forcing $\mathbb{P}$ satisfying the two items:

(1) $\mathbb{P}$ is λ^+-*cc* and has size $\leq 2^\lambda$;
(2) in $V^{\mathbb{P}}$, there exists a cofinal subset $\Lambda \subseteq \lambda$ such that for every function $f \in {}^\lambda\lambda \cap V$, there exists some $\xi \in \Lambda$ with $f(\xi) < \min(\Lambda \setminus (\xi+1))$.

Clearly, assuming a GCH-type assumption, the various notions of forcing for adding a fast club to λ (such as [DJ74, p. 97] and the minor variations [AS83, p. 650], [Rin09, p. 820]) belong to this class. Also, for infinite regular cardinals $\theta < \lambda = \lambda^{<\theta}$, the Lévy collapse $\mathrm{Col}(\theta,\lambda)$ belongs to $\mathbb{C}_\lambda$. The next proposition provides considerably more.

Proposition B. *Suppose that λ is a regular uncountable cardinal satisfying $2^\lambda = \lambda^+$.*

If $\mathbb{P}$ is a λ^+-cc notion of forcing of size $\leq 2^\lambda$, then each of the following implies that $\mathbb{P} \in \mathbb{C}_\lambda$:

- *$\mathbb{P}$ preserves the regularity of λ, and is not ${}^\lambda\lambda$-bounding;*[3]
- *$\mathbb{P}$ forces that λ is a singular cardinal;*
- *$\mathbb{P}$ forces that λ is a singular ordinal satisfying $2^{\mathrm{cf}(\lambda)} < \lambda$.*

It follows that Cohen, Prikry, Magidor and Radin forcing,[4] as well as some of the Namba-like forcings from the recent paper by Adolf, Apter, and Koepke [AAK16], are all members of the class under consideration.

Main Theorem. *Suppose that $\lambda = \lambda^{<\lambda}$ is a regular uncountable cardinal satisfying $2^\lambda = \lambda^+$.*

Let $\kappa := \lambda^+$. For all $\mathbb{P} \in \mathbb{C}_\lambda$, $V^{\mathbb{P}} \models \boxtimes^*(\kappa)+\diamondsuit(\kappa)$.

One of the aspects that makes the proof of the preceding somewhat difficult is the fact that we do not assume that $\mathbb{P}$ is cofinality-preserving, let alone assume that λ remains a regular cardinal in $V^{\mathbb{P}}$. In anticipation of constructions of κ-Souslin trees of a more involved nature, we will actually want to obtain a stronger principle than $\boxtimes^*(\kappa)$, which we denote by $\mathrm{P}^*(T,\lambda)$. This principle dictates a strong form of Clause (2) of Definition 1.2, in which it can be shown that all but nonstationarily

[3]Recall that a notion of forcing is ${}^\lambda\lambda$-*bounding* if for every $g \in {}^\lambda\lambda \cap V^{\mathbb{P}}$, there exists some $f \in {}^\lambda\lambda \cap V$ such that $g(\alpha) \leq f(\alpha)$ for all $\alpha < \lambda$.

[4]This includes variations likes the supercompact Prikry forcing and supercompact Magidor forcing (that singularizes a successor cardinal λ), and includes the instances of Radin forcing that preserves the inaccessibility of λ.

many $\alpha \in T$ will satisfy $|C| = |\lambda|$ for all $C \in \mathcal{C}_\alpha$. When combined with the welcomed possibility that $\mathbb{P}$ forces that λ is a singular cardinal (in which case $V^{\mathbb{P}} \models \lambda^{<\lambda} > \lambda$), ensuring Clause (1) of Definition 1.2 becomes a burden.

The definition of the weak square principle $\square^*_\lambda$ may be found in [Jen72, p. 283]. Whether $\mathsf{GCH}+\square^*_\lambda$ is consistent with the nonexistence of λ^+-Souslin trees for a singular cardinal λ is an open problem (see [Sch05]). In [BR16], generalizing a theorem of Gregory from [Gre76], we have shown that any model of such a consistency would have to satisfy that all stationary subsets of $E^{\lambda^+}_{\neq \mathrm{cf}(\lambda)}$ reflect. Now, by [CFM01, §11] and [CS02, §4], if GCH holds and λ is a λ^+-supercompact cardinal, then in the generic extension by Prikry forcing (using a normal measure on λ), $\mathsf{GCH} + \square^*_\lambda$ holds, and every stationary subset of $E^{\lambda^+}_{\neq \mathrm{cf}(\lambda)}$ reflects. The next corollary (which follows from Propositions A,B and the Main Theorem) implies that nevertheless, this model contains a λ^+-Souslin tree.

Corollary A. *Suppose that λ is a strongly inaccessible cardinal satisfying $2^\lambda = \lambda^+$.*

If $\mathbb{P}$ is a λ^+-cc notion of forcing of size $\leq 2^\lambda$ that makes λ into a singular cardinal, then $\mathbb{P}$ introduces a λ^+-Souslin tree.

Another corollary to the main result is the following:[5]

Corollary B. *Suppose that $\theta < \lambda = \lambda^{<\lambda}$ are infinite regular cardinals, and $2^\lambda = \lambda^+$.*

Then $\mathrm{Col}(\theta, \lambda)$ introduces a $|\lambda|^+$-Souslin tree.

At the end of this short paper we shall also quickly deal with the case that κ is a former inaccessible:

Proposition C. *Suppose that $\lambda^{<\lambda} = \lambda$ is an infinite cardinal, and $\kappa > \lambda$ is a strongly inaccessible cardinal. If $\mathbb{P}$ is a $(<\lambda)$-distributive, κ-cc notion of forcing, collapsing κ to λ^+, then $V^{\mathbb{P}} \models \boxtimes^*(\kappa) + \diamondsuit(\kappa)$ holds.*

Examples of notions of forcing satisfying the above requirements include the Lévy collapse $\mathrm{Col}(\lambda, <\kappa)$, and the Silver collapse $\mathbb{S}(\lambda, <\kappa)$.

Notation. For an infinite cardinal λ, write CH_λ for the assertion that $2^\lambda = \lambda^+$. Next, suppose that C, D are sets of ordinals. Write $\mathrm{acc}(C) := \{\alpha \in C \mid \sup(C \cap \alpha) = \alpha > 0\}$, $\mathrm{nacc}(C) := C \setminus \mathrm{acc}(C)$, and $\mathrm{acc}^+(C) := \{\alpha < \sup(C) \mid \sup(C \cap \alpha) = \alpha > 0\}$. For any $j < \mathrm{otp}(C)$, denote by $C(j)$ the unique element $\delta \in C$ for which $\mathrm{otp}(C \cap \delta) = j$. For any ordinal σ, write $\mathrm{succ}_\sigma(C) := \{C(j+1) \mid j < \sigma \ \&\ j+1 < \mathrm{otp}(C)\}$. Write $D \sqsubseteq C$ iff there exists some ordinal β such that $D = C \cap \beta$. Write $D \sqsubseteq^* C$ iff there exists $\gamma < \sup(D)$ such that $D \setminus \gamma \sqsubseteq C \setminus \gamma$. Write $D \,{}_\chi\!\sqsubseteq C$ iff $((D \sqsubseteq C)$ or $(\mathrm{cf}(\sup(D)) < \chi))$, and write $D \,{}_\chi\!\sqsubseteq^* C$ iff $((D \sqsubseteq^* C)$ or $(\mathrm{cf}(\sup(D)) < \chi))$.

Acknowledgment. We thank Gitik and Karagila for illuminating discussions on [Git95] and [DS95].

2. A construction of a Souslin tree from a weak hypothesis

We begin this section by recalling the terminology relevant to trees and fixing some notation.

A *tree* is a partially ordered set $(T, <_T)$ with the property that for every $x \in T$, the downward cone $x_\downarrow := \{y \in T \mid y <_T x\}$ is well-ordered by $<_T$. The *height* of $x \in T$, denoted $\mathrm{ht}(x)$, is the order-type of $(x_\downarrow, <_T)$. Then, the α^{th} level of $(T, <_T)$ is the set $T_\alpha := \{x \in T \mid \mathrm{ht}(x) = \alpha\}$. We also write $T \restriction X := \{t \in T \mid \mathrm{ht}(t) \in X\}$. A tree $(T, <_T)$ is said to be *χ-complete* if any $<_T$-increasing sequence of elements from T, and of length $< \chi$, has an upper bound in T. A tree $(T, <_T)$ is said

[5]But note that Proposition 3.6 yields a stronger conclusion from a weaker arithmetic assumption.

to be *normal* if for all ordinals $\alpha < \beta$ and every $x \in T_\alpha$, if $T_\beta \neq \emptyset$ then there exists some $y \in T_\beta$ such that $x <_T y$. A tree $(T, <_T)$ is said to be *splitting* if every node in T admits at least two immediate successors.

Let κ denote a regular uncountable cardinal. A tree $(T, <_T)$ is a *κ-tree* whenever $\{\alpha \mid T_\alpha \neq \emptyset\} = \kappa$, and $|T_\alpha| < \kappa$ for all $\alpha < \kappa$. A subset $B \subseteq T$ is a *cofinal branch* if $(B, <_T)$ is linearly ordered and $\{\mathrm{ht}(t) \mid t \in B\} = \{\mathrm{ht}(t) \mid t \in T\}$. A *$\kappa$-Aronszajn tree* is a κ-tree with no cofinal branches. A *κ-Souslin tree* is a κ-Aronszajn tree that has no antichains of size κ.

A κ-tree is said to be *binary* if it is a downward-closed subset of the complete binary tree ${}^{<\kappa}2$, ordered by $\subset$.

All the combinatorial principles considered in this paper are simplified instances of the proxy principle $\mathrm{P}^-(\kappa, \mu, \mathcal{R}, \theta, \mathcal{S}, \nu, \sigma, \mathcal{E})$ that was introduced and studied in [BR15a],[BR16], but familiarity with those papers is not needed.

Definition 2.1. Suppose that κ is a regular uncountable cardinal, and S is a stationary subset of κ. Let $\chi := \min\{\mathrm{cf}(\alpha) \mid \alpha \in S \text{ limit}\}$. The principle $\boxtimes^*(S)$ asserts the existence of a sequence $\langle \mathcal{C}_\alpha \mid \alpha < \kappa\rangle$ such that:

(1) For every limit ordinal $\alpha < \kappa$:
   - $\mathcal{C}_\alpha$ is a nonempty collection of club subsets of α, with $|\mathcal{C}_\alpha| < \kappa$;
   - if $C \in \mathcal{C}_\alpha$ and $\bar\alpha$ is an accumulation point of C, then there exists some $D \in \mathcal{C}_{\bar\alpha}$ satisfying $D \,{}_\chi\sqsubseteq^* C$;

(2) For every cofinal $A \subseteq \kappa$, there exist stationarily many $\alpha \in S$ such that $\sup(\mathrm{nacc}(C) \cap A) = \alpha$ for all $C \in \mathcal{C}_\alpha$.

Remarks.
i. While it is not entirely obvious, we omit the proof of the fact that $\boxtimes^*(S)$ for $S = \kappa$ coincides with Definition 1.2 given in the previous section.
ii. Note that in general, it is not the case that $\boxtimes^*(S)$ implies $\boxtimes^*(T)$ for $T \supseteq S$.
iii. By [Tod87, Theorem 1.8], if κ is a weakly compact cardinal, then $\boxtimes^*(S)$ fails for every stationary subset $S \subseteq \kappa$.
iv. In the langauge of [BR15a],[BR16], $\boxtimes^*(S)$ stands for $\mathrm{P}^-(\kappa, \kappa, {}_\chi\sqsubseteq^*, 1, \{S\}, \kappa, 1, \mathcal{E}_\kappa)$. In particular, by [BR15a], $\boxtimes^*(E^\kappa_{\geq\chi}) + \diamondsuit(\kappa)$ is consistent together with $\neg\diamondsuit(E^\kappa_{\geq\chi})$.

Proposition A is a special case of the following:

Proposition 2.2. *If κ is a regular uncountable cardinal and $\chi < \kappa$ is a cardinal satisfying $\lambda^{<\chi} < \kappa$ for all $\lambda < \kappa$, then $\boxtimes^*(E^\kappa_{\geq\chi}) + \diamondsuit(\kappa)$ entails a normal, binary, splitting, χ-complete κ-Souslin tree.*

Proof. In [BR15a, §2], we provided a construction of a χ-complete κ-Souslin using the stronger hypothesis $\boxtimes^-(E^\kappa_{\geq\chi})$. Here we show that by taking some extra care in the construction, we can get by assuming merely $\boxtimes^*(E^\kappa_{\geq\chi})$.

Let $\vec{\mathcal{C}} = \langle \mathcal{C}_\alpha \mid \alpha < \kappa\rangle$ be a witness to $\boxtimes^*(E^\kappa_{\geq\chi})$. By [BR15a, §2], $\diamondsuit(\kappa)$ is equivalent to $\diamondsuit(H_\kappa)$, meaning that, in particular, we may fix a sequence $\langle \Omega_\beta \mid \beta < \kappa\rangle$ satisfying the following: For every $\Omega \subseteq H_\kappa$ and $p \in H_{\kappa^+}$, there exists an elementary submodel $\mathcal{M} \prec H_{\kappa^+}$ containing p, such that $\mathcal{M} \cap \kappa \in \kappa$ and $\mathcal{M} \cap \Omega = \Omega_{\mathcal{M}\cap\kappa}$.

Let $\lhd$ be some well-ordering of H_κ. We shall recursively construct a sequence $\langle T_\alpha \mid \alpha < \kappa\rangle$ of levels whose union will ultimately be the desired tree T.

Let $T_0 := \{\emptyset\}$, and for all $\alpha < \kappa$, let $T_{\alpha+1} := \{t^\frown\langle 0\rangle, t^\frown\langle 1\rangle \mid t \in T_\alpha\}$.

Next, suppose that $\alpha < \kappa$ is a nonzero limit ordinal, and that $\langle T_\beta \mid \beta < \alpha\rangle$ has already been defined. Constructing the level T_α involves deciding which branches through $(T \restriction \alpha, \subset)$ will have

their limits placed into the tree. We need T_α to contain enough nodes to ensure that the tree is normal, but we have to define T_α carefully, so that the resulting tree doesn't include large antichains.

Construction of the level T_α splits into two cases, depending on the value of $\mathrm{cf}(\alpha)$:

▶ If $\mathrm{cf}(\alpha) < \chi$, let T_α consist of the limits of all branches through $(T \restriction \alpha, \subset)$. This construction ensures that the tree will be χ-complete, and as any branch through $(T \restriction \alpha, \subset)$ is determined by a subset of $T \restriction \alpha$ of cardinality $\mathrm{cf}(\alpha)$, the arithmetic hypothesis ensures that $|T_\alpha| < \kappa$ at these levels. Normality at these levels is verified by induction: Fixing a sequence of ordinals of minimal order-type converging to α enables us to find, for any given $x \in T \restriction \alpha$, a branch through $(T \restriction \alpha, \subset)$ containing x, and the limit of such a branch will necessarily be in T_α.

▶ Now suppose $\mathrm{cf}(\alpha) \geq \chi$. Considering any $C \in \mathcal{C}_\alpha$, the idea for ensuring normality at level T_α is to attach to each node $x \in T \restriction C$ some node $\mathbf{b}^C_x : \alpha \to 2$ above it, and then let

$$T_\alpha := \{\mathbf{b}^C_x \mid C \in \mathcal{C}_\alpha, x \in T \restriction C\}.$$

By the induction hypothesis, $|T_\beta| < \kappa$ for all $\beta < \alpha$, and by the choice of $\vec{\mathcal{C}}$, we have $|\mathcal{C}_\alpha| < \kappa$, so that we are guaranteed to end up with $|T_\alpha| < \kappa$.

Let $C \in \mathcal{C}_\alpha$ and $x \in T \restriction C$ be arbitrary. As $\mathbf{b}^C_x$ will be the limit of some branch through $(T \restriction \alpha, \subset)$ and above x, it makes sense to describe $\mathbf{b}^C_x$ as the limit $\bigcup \mathrm{Im}(b^C_x)$ of a sequence $b^C_x \in \prod_{\beta \in C \setminus \mathrm{dom}(x)} T_\beta$ such that:

- $b^C_x(\mathrm{dom}(x)) = x$;
- $b^C_x(\beta') \subset b^C_x(\beta)$ for all $\beta' < \beta$ in $(C \setminus \mathrm{dom}(x))$;
- $b^C_x(\beta) = \bigcup \mathrm{Im}(b^C_x \restriction \beta)$ for all $\beta \in \mathrm{acc}(C \setminus \mathrm{dom}(x))$.

Of course, we have to define b^C_x carefully, so that the resulting tree doesn't include large antichains. We do this by recursion:

Let $b^C_x(\mathrm{dom}(x)) := x$. Next, suppose $\beta^- < \beta$ are consecutive points of $(C \setminus \mathrm{dom}(x))$, and $b^C_x(\beta^-) \in T_{\beta^-}$ has already been identified. In order to decide $b^C_x(\beta)$, we advise with the following set:

$$Q^{C,\beta}_x := \{t \in T_\beta \mid \exists s \in \Omega_\beta[(s \cup b^C_x(\beta^-)) \subseteq t]\}.$$

Now, consider the two possibilities:

- If $Q^{C,\beta}_x \neq \emptyset$, then let $b^C_x(\beta)$ be its $\lhd$-least element;
- Otherwise, let $b^C_x(\beta)$ be the $\lhd$-least element of T_β that extends $b^C_x(\beta^-)$. Such an element must exist, as the level T_β was constructed so as to preserve normality.

Finally, suppose $\beta \in \mathrm{acc}(C \setminus \mathrm{dom}(x))$ and $b^C_x \restriction \beta \in \prod_{\delta \in C \cap \beta \setminus \mathrm{dom}(x)} T_\delta$ has already been defined. As promised, we let $b^C_x(\beta) := \bigcup \mathrm{Im}(b^C_x \restriction \beta)$. It is clear that $b^C_x(\beta) \in {}^\beta 2$, but we need more than that:

Claim 2.2.1. $b^C_x(\beta) \in T_\beta$.

Proof. We consider two cases, depending on the value of $\mathrm{cf}(\beta)$:

▶ If $\mathrm{cf}(\beta) < \chi$, then T_β was constructed to consist of the limits of all branches through $(T \restriction \beta, \subset)$, including the limit of the branch $b^C_x \restriction \beta$, which is $b^C_x(\beta)$.

▶ Now suppose $\mathrm{cf}(\beta) \geq \chi$. In this case, since $\beta \in \mathrm{acc}(C)$ and by ${}_\chi\sqsubseteq^*$-coherence of the $\boxtimes^*(E^\kappa_{\geq\chi})$-sequence $\vec{\mathcal{C}}$, we can pick some $D \in \mathcal{C}_\beta$ such that $D \sqsubseteq^* C$, and we can thus fix some $\gamma \in (C \cap D) \setminus \mathrm{dom}(x)$ such that $D \setminus \gamma = C \cap \beta \setminus \gamma$. Put $d := D \setminus \gamma$ and $y := b^C_x(\gamma)$. Then $y \in T_\gamma$ and $\mathrm{dom}(b^D_y) = d = C \cap \beta \setminus \gamma = \mathrm{dom}(b^C_x) \cap \beta \setminus \gamma$.

It suffices to prove that $b^C_x \restriction d = b^D_y$, as this will imply that $b^C_x(\beta) = \bigcup \mathrm{Im}(b^D_y) = \mathbf{b}^D_y \in T_\beta$, since the limit of a branch is determined by any of its cofinal segments. Thus, we prove by induction that for every $\delta \in d$, the value of $b^D_y(\delta)$ was determined in exactly the same way as $b^C_x(\delta)$:

- Clearly, $b^D_y(\min(d)) = y = b^C_x(\min(d))$, since $\min(d) = \gamma = \mathrm{dom}(y)$.
- Suppose $\delta^- < \delta$ are successive points of d. Notice that the definition of $Q^{C,\delta}_x$ depends only on $b^C_x(\delta^-)$, Ω_δ, and T_δ, and so if $b^C_x(\delta^-) = b^D_y(\delta^-)$, then $Q^{C,\delta}_x = Q^{D,\delta}_y$, and hence $b^C_x(\delta) = b^D_y(\delta)$.
- For $\delta \in \mathrm{acc}(d)$: If the sequences are identical up to δ, then their limits must be identical. □

This completes the definition of b^C_x for each $C \in \mathcal{C}_\alpha$ and each $x \in T \restriction C$, and hence of the level T_α.

Having constructed all levels of the tree, we then let

$$T := \bigcup_{\alpha<\kappa} T_\alpha.$$

Notice that for every $\alpha < \kappa$, T_α is a subset of ${}^\alpha 2$ of size $< \kappa$. Altogether, $(T, \subset)$ is a normal, binary, splitting, χ-complete κ-tree.

Our next task is proving that $(T, \subset)$ is κ-Souslin. As any splitting κ-tree with no antichains of size κ also has no chains of size κ, it suffices to prove Claim 2.2.3 below. For this, we shall need the following:

Claim 2.2.2. *Suppose that $A \subseteq T$ is a maximal antichain. Then the set*

$$B := \{\beta < \kappa \mid A \cap (T \restriction \beta) = \Omega_\beta \text{ is a maximal antichain in } T \restriction \beta\}.$$

is a stationary subset of κ.

Proof. Let $D \subseteq \kappa$ be an arbitrary club. We must show that $D \cap B \neq \emptyset$. Put $p := \{A, T, D\}$ and $\Omega := A$. By our choice of the sequence $\langle \Omega_\beta \mid \beta < \kappa\rangle$, pick $\mathcal{M} \prec H_{\kappa^+}$ with $p \in \mathcal{M}$ such that $\beta := \mathcal{M} \cap \kappa$ is in κ and $\Omega_\beta = \mathcal{M} \cap A$. Since $D \in \mathcal{M}$ and D is club in κ, we have $\beta \in D$. We claim that $\beta \in B$.

For all $\alpha < \beta$, by $\alpha, T \in \mathcal{M}$, we have $T_\alpha \in \mathcal{M}$, and by $\mathcal{M} \models |T_\alpha| < \kappa$, we have $T_\alpha \subseteq \mathcal{M}$. So $T \restriction \beta \subseteq \mathcal{M}$. As $\mathrm{dom}(z) \in \mathcal{M}$ for all $z \in T \cap \mathcal{M}$, we conclude that $T \cap \mathcal{M} = T \restriction \beta$. Thus, $\Omega_\beta = A \cap (T \restriction \beta)$. As $H_{\kappa^+} \models A$ is a maximal antichain in T, it follows by elementarity that $\mathcal{M} \models A$ is a maximal antichain in T. Since $T \cap \mathcal{M} = T \restriction \beta$, we get that $A \cap (T \restriction \beta)$ is a maximal antichain in $T \restriction \beta$. □

Claim 2.2.3. *Suppose that $A \subseteq T$ is a maximal antichain. Then $|A| < \kappa$.*

Proof. Let $A \subseteq T$ be a maximal antichain. By Claim 2.2.2,

$$B := \{\beta < \kappa \mid A \cap (T \restriction \beta) = \Omega_\beta \text{ is a maximal antichain in } T \restriction \beta\}$$

is a stationary subset of κ. Thus we apply $\boxtimes^*(E^\kappa_{\geq\chi})$ to obtain an ordinal $\alpha \in E^\kappa_{\geq\chi}$ satisfying

$$\sup(\mathrm{nacc}(C) \cap B) = \alpha$$

for every $C \in \mathcal{C}_\alpha$.

We shall prove that $A \subseteq T \restriction \alpha$, from which it follows that $|A| \leq |T \restriction \alpha| < \kappa$.

To see that $A \subseteq T \restriction \alpha$, consider any $z \in T \restriction (\kappa \setminus \alpha)$, and we will show that $z \notin A$ by finding some element of $A \cap (T \restriction \alpha)$ compatible with z.

Since $\mathrm{dom}(z) \geq \alpha$, we can let $y := z \restriction \alpha$. Then $y \in T_\alpha$ and $y \subseteq z$. By construction, since $\mathrm{cf}(\alpha) \geq \chi$, we have $y = \mathbf{b}^C_x = \bigcup_{\beta\in C\setminus \mathrm{dom}(x)} b^C_x(\beta)$ for some $C \in \mathcal{C}_\alpha$ and some $x \in T \restriction C$. Fix $\beta \in \mathrm{nacc}(C) \cap B$ with $\mathrm{dom}(x) < \beta < \alpha$. Denote $\beta^- := \sup(C \cap \beta)$. Then $\beta^- < \beta$ are consecutive points of $C \setminus \mathrm{dom}(x)$. Since $\beta \in B$, we know that $\Omega_\beta = A \cap (T \restriction \beta)$ is a maximal antichain in $T \restriction \beta$, and hence there is some $s \in \Omega_\beta$ compatible with $b^C_x(\beta^-)$, so that by normality of the tree, $Q^{C,\beta}_x \neq \emptyset$.

It follows that we chose $b^C_x(\beta)$ to extend some $s \in \Omega_\beta$. Altogether, $s \subseteq b^C_x(\beta) \subset \mathbf{b}^C_x = y \subseteq z$. Since s is an element of the antichain A, the fact that z extends s implies that $z \notin A$. □

So $(T, \subset)$ is a normal, binary, splitting, χ-complete κ-Souslin tree. □

3. Main Results

We begin this section by proving Proposition B:

Proposition 3.1. *Suppose that λ is a regular uncountable cardinal satisfying $2^\lambda = \lambda^+$.*

If $\mathbb{P}$ is a λ^+-cc notion of forcing of size $\leq 2^\lambda$, then each of the following implies that $\mathbb{P} \in \mathbb{C}_\lambda$:

(1) $\mathbb{P}$ preserves the regularity of λ, and is not ${}^\lambda\lambda$-bounding;

(2) $\mathbb{P}$ forces that λ is a singular cardinal;

(3) $\mathbb{P}$ forces that λ is a singular ordinal, satisfying $2^{\mathrm{cf}(\lambda)} < \lambda$.

Proof. Let G denote a $\mathbb{P}$-generic filter.

(1) Work in $V[G]$. Since $\mathbb{P}$ is not ${}^\lambda\lambda$-bounding, let us pick $g \in {}^\lambda\lambda$ with the property that for every $f \in {}^\lambda\lambda \cap V$, there exists some $\alpha < \lambda$ with $f(\alpha) < g(\alpha)$. Since λ is regular and uncountable, the set $\Lambda := \{\zeta < \lambda \mid g[\zeta] \subseteq \zeta\}$ is a club in λ. To see that Λ works, let $f \in {}^\lambda\lambda \cap V$ be arbitrary. In V, let $f' : \lambda \to \lambda$ be a strictly increasing function such that $f(\xi) \leq f'(\xi)$ for all $\xi < \lambda$. Now, back in $V[G]$, pick $\alpha < \lambda$ such that $f'(\alpha) < g(\alpha)$. Put $\xi := \sup(\Lambda \cap (\alpha + 1))$ and $\zeta := \min(\Lambda \setminus (\xi + 1))$. Then $\xi \in \Lambda$ because Λ is a club in λ containing 0, and $f(\xi) \leq f'(\xi) \leq f'(\alpha) < g(\alpha) < \zeta$ because $\alpha < \zeta$ and $\zeta \in \Lambda$.

(2) Note that as $\mathbb{P}$ forces that λ is a singular cardinal, λ cannot be a successor cardinal in the ground model. Also note that by the λ^+-*cc* of $\mathbb{P}$, we have $(\lambda^+)^{V[G]} = (\lambda^+)^V$. Thus, by [DS95, Theorem 2.0], since λ is inaccessible, $(\lambda^+)^{V[G]} = (\lambda^+)^V$ and $2^\lambda = \lambda^+$, there exists a cofinal $\Lambda \subseteq \lambda$ in $V[G]$ such that $\sup(\Lambda \setminus C) < \lambda$ for every club C in λ from V. Thus, to see that Λ works, let $f \in {}^\lambda\lambda \cap V$ be arbitrary. Consider the club $C := \{\zeta < \lambda \mid f[\zeta] \subseteq \zeta\}$. As $C \in V$, pick $\xi \in \Lambda$ such that $\Lambda \setminus \xi \subseteq C$. Put $\zeta := \min(\Lambda \setminus (\xi + 1))$. Then $\zeta \in C$ and hence $f(\xi) < \zeta$.

(3) Let $\kappa := (\lambda^+)^V$. Work in $V[G]$. Let $\theta := \mathrm{cf}(\lambda)$. By $2^\theta < \lambda$, we have $(2^\theta)^+ \leq |\lambda|^+$. Since $\mathbb{P}$ is κ-*cc*, we have $|\lambda|^+ = \kappa$. In particular, $\mathrm{cf}(\kappa) = \kappa \geq (2^\theta)^+$. Also, by $2^\theta < \lambda$, we have $\theta^+ < \lambda$. Then, the two conditions of [Git95, Proposition 2.1] are satisfied and hence there exists a cofinal $\Lambda \subseteq \lambda$ such that $\sup(\Lambda \setminus C) < \lambda$ for every club C in λ from V. Thus, we are done as in the previous case. □

Lemma 3.2. *Suppose that λ is a regular uncountable cardinal, and $\mathbb{P} \in \mathbb{C}_\lambda$.*

In $V^{\mathbb{P}}$, there exists a club $\Lambda \subseteq \lambda$ of order-type $\mathrm{cf}(\lambda)$, such that for every function $f \in {}^\lambda\lambda \cap V$, $\sup\{\xi \in \Lambda \mid f(\xi) < \min(\Lambda \setminus (\xi + 1))\} = \lambda$.

Proof. Let G be $\mathbb{P}$-generic, and work in $V[G]$. Pick Λ as in Clause (2) of Definition 1.3. Let $\mathring{\Lambda}$ be a club in λ of order-type $\mathrm{cf}(\lambda)$ such that $\mathrm{nacc}(\mathring{\Lambda}) \subseteq \Lambda$. To see that $\mathring{\Lambda}$ works, fix an arbitrary $f \in {}^\lambda\lambda \cap V$ and an arbitrary $\iota < \lambda$. We shall find $\mathring{\xi} \in \mathring{\Lambda}$ above ι satisfying $f(\mathring{\xi}) < \min(\mathring{\Lambda} \setminus (\mathring{\xi} + 1))$.

Fix a large enough $\epsilon \in \mathrm{nacc}(\mathring{\Lambda})$ such that $\sup(\mathring{\Lambda} \cap \epsilon) > \iota$. In V, using the regularity of λ, pick a strictly increasing function $f' : \lambda \to \lambda$ such that $f'(\alpha) \geq \max\{f(\alpha), \epsilon\}$ for all $\alpha < \lambda$. By the choice of Λ, let us pick $\xi \in \Lambda$ such that $f'(\xi) < \min(\Lambda \setminus (\xi + 1))$. In particular, $\epsilon < \zeta$, where $\zeta := \min(\Lambda \setminus (\xi + 1))$. As $\epsilon \in \mathrm{nacc}(\mathring{\Lambda}) \subseteq \Lambda$, and as $\xi < \zeta$ are two successive elements of Λ with $\epsilon < \zeta$, we have $\epsilon \leq \xi$. Put $\mathring{\xi} := \sup(\mathring{\Lambda} \cap (\xi + 1))$ and $\mathring{\zeta} := \min(\mathring{\Lambda} \setminus (\mathring{\xi} + 1))$. By $\xi \geq \epsilon$ and $\sup(\mathring{\Lambda} \cap \epsilon) > \iota$, we have $\mathring{\xi} > \iota$. By $\mathring{\zeta} \in \mathrm{nacc}(\mathring{\Lambda}) \setminus (\mathring{\xi} + 1) \subseteq \Lambda \setminus (\xi + 1)$, we have $\mathring{\zeta} \geq \zeta$. Altogether:

- $\iota < \mathring{\xi} \leq \xi < \zeta \leq \mathring{\zeta}$, and

- $f(\mathring{\xi}) \leq f'(\mathring{\xi}) \leq f'(\xi) < \zeta \leq \mathring{\zeta} = \min(\mathring{\Lambda} \setminus (\mathring{\xi}+1))$,

So that $\mathring{\xi}$ is as sought. □

Definition 3.3. Suppose that T is a stationary subset of a regular uncountable cardinal κ, and $\xi \leq \kappa$ is an ordinal.

The principle $\mathrm{P}^*(T,\xi)$ asserts the existence of a sequence $\langle \mathcal{C}_\alpha \mid \alpha < \kappa\rangle$ such that:

(1) For every limit ordinal $\alpha < \kappa$:
   - $\mathcal{C}_\alpha$ is a nonempty collection of club subsets of α of order-type $\leq \xi$, with $|\mathcal{C}_\alpha| < \kappa$;
   - if $C \in \mathcal{C}_\alpha$ and $\bar{\alpha}$ is an accumulation point of C, then $C \cap \bar{\alpha} \in \mathcal{C}_{\bar{\alpha}}$;

(2) For every cofinal subset $A \subseteq \kappa$, all but nonstationarily many $\alpha \in T$ satisfy:
   - $|\mathcal{C}_\alpha| = 1$, say, $\mathcal{C}_\alpha = \{C_\alpha\}$, and
   - $\sup\{\beta \in C_\alpha \mid \mathrm{succ}_\sigma(C_\alpha \setminus \beta) \subseteq A\} = \alpha$ for every $\sigma < \mathrm{otp}(C_\alpha)$.

Remarks. i. Note that for stationary sets $S \subseteq T \subseteq \kappa$, $\mathrm{P}^*(T,\xi) \implies \mathrm{P}^*(S,\xi) \implies \mathrm{P}^*(S,\kappa) \implies \boxtimes^*(S)$, and that $\mathrm{P}^*(S,\kappa) \implies \boxtimes^*(\kappa)$. Thus, the remaining theorems in this paper will focus on establishing $\mathrm{P}^*(T,\xi) + \diamondsuit(\kappa)$ for some stationary $T \subseteq \kappa$ and some $\xi \leq \kappa$ in various forcing scenarios.

ii. By arguments that may be found in [BR15b, §6], $\mathrm{P}^*(S,\kappa) + \diamondsuit(\kappa)$ entails the existence of a κ-Souslin tree which is moreover *free*. We do not know whether $\boxtimes^*(\kappa) + \diamondsuit(\kappa)$ suffices for this application.

iii. In the langauge of [BR15a],[BR16], $\mathrm{P}^*(T,\xi)$ stands for $\mathrm{P}^-(\kappa,\kappa,\sqsubseteq,1,\mathrm{NS}_\kappa \restriction T,2,<\infty,\mathcal{E}_\xi)$.

We now arrive at the main result of this paper:

Theorem 3.4. *Suppose that $\lambda^{<\lambda} = \lambda$ is a regular uncountable cardinal, and CH_λ holds.*
Let $\kappa := \lambda^+$ and $T := E^\kappa_\lambda$. For every $\mathbb{P} \in \mathbb{C}_\lambda$, $V^{\mathbb{P}} \models \mathrm{P}^*(T,\lambda) + \diamondsuit(\kappa)$.

Proof. By CH_λ and the main result of [She10], $\diamondsuit(\kappa)$ holds. By [BR15a, §2], $\diamondsuit(\kappa)$ is equivalent to $\diamondsuit(H_\kappa)$, meaning that, in particular, we may fix a sequence $\langle \Omega_\beta \mid \beta < \kappa\rangle$ satisfying the following: For every $\Omega \subseteq H_\kappa$ and $p \in H_{\kappa^+}$, there exists an elementary submodel $\mathcal{M} \prec H_{\kappa^+}$ containing p, such that $\mathcal{M} \cap \kappa \in \kappa$ and $\mathcal{M} \cap \Omega = \Omega_{\mathcal{M}\cap\kappa}$.

Let $\mathbb{P} \in \mathbb{C}_\lambda$ be arbitrary. By $|\mathbb{P}| \leq |H_\kappa|$, we may assume that $\mathbb{P} \subseteq H_\kappa$. Let $G \subseteq \mathbb{P}$ be V-generic, and work in $V[G]$. Since $\mathbb{P}$ is a κ-*cc* notion of forcing, κ remains a regular cardinal and T remains stationary in $V[G]$.

For all $\beta < \kappa$ such that Ω_β happens to be a $\mathbb{P}$-name for a subset of β, let Z_β denote its interpretation by G. For all other $\beta < \kappa$, let $Z_\beta := \emptyset$.

Claim 3.4.1. *For every $A \in \mathcal{P}^{V[G]}(\kappa)$, there exists some $X_A \in \mathcal{P}^V(\kappa)$ such that:*

(1) $V \models X_A$ is stationary;
(2) $V[G] \models X_A \subseteq \{\beta < \kappa \mid Z_\beta = A \cap \beta\}$.

Proof. Fix an arbitrary $A \subseteq \kappa$ in $V[G]$, and let $\dot{A}$ be a $\mathbb{P}$-name for A.

Work in V. For every $\alpha < \kappa$, put $O_\alpha := \{p \in \mathbb{P} \mid p \Vdash_{\mathbb{P}} \check{\alpha} \in \dot{A}\}$, and choose some maximal antichain $A_\alpha \subseteq O_\alpha$. Then $\Omega := \bigcup\{\{\check{\alpha}\} \times A_\alpha \mid \alpha < \kappa\}$ is a *nice name* for A. In particular:

- A_α is an antichain in $\mathbb{P}$ for all $\alpha < \kappa$;
- $\Vdash_{\mathbb{P}} \dot{A} = \Omega$.

Since $\mathbb{P} \subseteq H_\kappa$ is a κ-*cc* notion of forcing, we also have:

- $A_\alpha \in H_\kappa$ for all $\alpha < \kappa$.

Altogether, $\Omega \subseteq H_\kappa$, $|\Omega| \leq \kappa$, and hence $\Omega \in H_{\kappa^+}$. Let

$$X_A := \{\mathcal{M} \cap \kappa \mid \mathcal{M} \prec H_{\kappa^+}, \Omega \in \mathcal{M}, \mathcal{M} \cap \kappa \in \kappa, \mathcal{M} \cap \Omega = \Omega_{\mathcal{M}\cap\kappa}\}.$$

(1) To see that X_A is stationary, let D be an arbitrary club in κ. Put $p := \{\Omega, D\}$. By the fixed witness to $\diamondsuit(H_\kappa)$, we may now pick an elementary submodel $\mathcal{M} \prec H_{\kappa^+}$ such that $p \in \mathcal{M}$, $\mathcal{M} \cap \kappa \in \kappa$ and $\mathcal{M} \cap \Omega = \Omega_{\mathcal{M}\cap\kappa}$. Denote $\beta := \mathcal{M} \cap \kappa$. By $D \in \mathcal{M}$, we have $\beta \in D \cap X_A$.

(2) Let $\beta \in X_A$ be arbitrary, with witnessing model $\mathcal{M}$. By $\Omega \in \mathcal{M}$ and $|A_\alpha| < \kappa$ for all $\alpha < \kappa$, we have $\Omega_\beta = \mathcal{M} \cap \Omega = \bigcup\{\{\check{\alpha}\} \times A_\alpha \mid \alpha < \beta\}$. So Ω_β is a nice name and $\Vdash_{\mathbb{P}} \Omega_\beta = \Omega \cap \check{\beta} = \dot{A} \cap \check{\beta}$. That is, Ω_β is a $\mathbb{P}$-name whose interpretation in $V[G]$ is $A \cap \beta$, and hence $V[G] \models Z_\beta = A \cap \beta$. $\square$

Since $\mathbb{P}$ is a κ-*cc* notion of forcing, every stationary subset of κ from V remains stationary in $V[G]$, and so it follows from the previous claim that $\diamondsuit(\kappa)$ holds in $V[G]$. Thus, we are left with verifying that $\mathrm{P}^*(T, \lambda)$ holds in $V[G]$.

Work back in V. By $\lambda^{<\lambda} = \lambda$, let us fix a sequence of injections $\langle \varrho_\alpha : \alpha \to \lambda \mid \alpha < \kappa\rangle$ with the property that for all $\delta < \kappa$, we have $|\{\varrho_\alpha \restriction \delta \mid \alpha < \kappa\}| < \kappa$.[6] For every $\alpha \in T$, let $\pi_\alpha : \lambda \to E^\alpha_{<\lambda}$ denote the monotone enumeration of some club in α. Notice that $\mathrm{Im}(\pi_\alpha) \cap T = \emptyset$ for every $\alpha \in T$.

By CH_λ, let us fix an enumeration $\{X^j \mid j < \kappa\}$ of all bounded subsets of κ such that each element appears cofinally often.

Next, for every nonempty $x \in [\kappa]^{<\lambda}$ and every $\beta \in x \cap T$, define $h_{x,\beta} : \mathrm{otp}(x) \to [\beta]^1 \cup [\beta]^{(1+\mathrm{otp}(x))}$ as follows:

Put $h_{x,\beta}(0) := \{\sup(x \cap \beta)\}$. Now, if $i \in (0, \mathrm{otp}(x))$ and $h_{x,\beta} \restriction i$ has already been defined, write $\epsilon_{x,\beta}(i) := \sup(\bigcup_{i'<i} h_{x,\beta}(i')) + 1$ and $j := x(i)$. Then:

- If $\sup(X^j \cap \beta) \neq \beta$, then let $h_{x,\beta}(i) := \{\epsilon_{x,\beta}(i)\}$;
- If $\sup(X^j \cap \beta) = \beta$, then let $h_{x,\beta}(i) := \{\epsilon_{x,\beta}(i)\} \cup \mathrm{succ}_{\mathrm{otp}(x)}(X^j \setminus \epsilon_{x,\beta}(i))$.

Note that all of the above are well-defined, thanks to the fact that $\mathrm{cf}(\beta) = \lambda > |x|$.

Finally, for every nonempty $x \in [\kappa]^{<\lambda}$, let $\overline{x}$ be the ordinal closure of

$$x \cup \bigcup\{\bigcup \mathrm{Im}(h_{x,\beta}) \mid \beta \in x \cap T, \beta \neq \min(x)\}.$$

Clearly, $\min(\overline{x}) = \min(x)$, $\max(\overline{x}) = \sup(x)$, and $|\overline{x}| \leq \max\{|x|, \aleph_0\}$. In particular, $\mathrm{otp}(\overline{x}) < \lambda$. In addition, for all $\beta \in x \cap T$ such that $\gamma := \sup(x \cap \beta)$ is nonzero, we have that $\overline{x} \cap [\gamma, \beta)$ is equal to the ordinal closure of $\bigcup \mathrm{Im}(h_{x,\beta})$.

Work in $V[G]$. By $\mathbb{P} \in \mathbb{C}_\lambda$, let Λ be the club given by Lemma 3.2. For all $\alpha \in T$, let:

$$C_\alpha := \bigcup \left\{ \overline{[\pi_\alpha(\xi), \pi_\alpha(\zeta)) \cap (\{\pi_\alpha(\xi)\} \cup \varrho_\alpha^{-1}[\zeta])} \mid \xi \in \Lambda, \zeta = \min(\Lambda \setminus (\xi + 1)) \right\}.$$

Notice that $\pi_\alpha[\Lambda] \subseteq C_\alpha \subseteq \alpha$, so that C_α is a club in α.

Before stating the next claim, let us remind the reader that we do not assume that $\mathbb{P}$ is cofinality-preserving.

Claim 3.4.2. *For every $\alpha \in T$:*

(1) $\mathrm{acc}(C_\alpha) \cap T = \emptyset$;
(2) $\mathrm{otp}(C_\alpha) \leq \lambda$.

[6] Note that the existence of such a sequence is equivalent to the existence of a special λ^+-Aronszajn tree, which is a well-known consequence of $\lambda^{<\lambda} = \lambda$ (cf. [Spe49] or [Tod84, Theorem 7.1]).

Proof. (1) Suppose that $\bar{\alpha} \in \mathrm{acc}(C_\alpha)$. Put $\xi' := \sup\{\xi \in \Lambda \mid \pi_\alpha(\xi) \leq \bar{\alpha}\}$.

▶ If $\bar{\alpha} = \pi_\alpha(\xi')$, then $\bar{\alpha} \in \mathrm{Im}(\pi_\alpha)$ and hence $\bar{\alpha} \notin T$.

▶ Otherwise, letting $\zeta' := \min(\Lambda \setminus (\xi'+1))$, we get that $\bar{\alpha}$ is an accumulation point of

$$\overline{[\pi_\alpha(\xi'), \pi_\alpha(\zeta')) \cap (\{\pi_\alpha(\xi')\} \cup \varrho_\alpha^{-1}[\zeta'])},$$

which is a set of ordinals from V of size $< \lambda$, and hence $\mathrm{cf}^V(\bar{\alpha}) < \lambda$, so that $\bar{\alpha} \notin T$.

(2) We prove by induction on $\xi \in \Lambda$ that $\mathrm{otp}(C_\alpha \cap \pi_\alpha(\xi)) < \lambda$ for all $\xi \in \Lambda$:

▶ For $\xi = \min(\Lambda)$, we have $C_\alpha \cap \pi_\alpha(\xi) = \emptyset$.

▶ Suppose that $\xi \in \Lambda$ and $\mathrm{otp}(C_\alpha \cap \pi_\alpha(\xi)) < \lambda$. Put $\zeta := \min(\Lambda \setminus (\xi+1))$. Then

$$\mathrm{otp}(C_\alpha \cap \pi_\alpha(\zeta)) = \mathrm{otp}(C_\alpha \cap \pi_\alpha(\xi)) + \mathrm{otp}\left(\overline{[\pi_\alpha(\xi), \pi_\alpha(\zeta)) \cap (\{\pi_\alpha(\xi)\} \cup \varrho_\alpha^{-1}[\zeta])}\right),$$

so that $\mathrm{otp}(C_\alpha \cap \pi_\alpha(\zeta))$ is the sum of two ordinals $< \lambda$. As λ is a cardinal in V, it is an additively indecomposable ordinal, and hence the sum of the two is still $< \lambda$.

▶ Suppose that $\xi \in \mathrm{acc}(\Lambda)$ and $\mathrm{otp}(C_\alpha \cap \pi_\alpha(\epsilon)) < \lambda$ for all $\epsilon \in \Lambda \cap \xi$. That is,

$$\{\mathrm{otp}(C_\alpha \cap \pi_\alpha(\epsilon)) \mid \epsilon \in \Lambda \cap \xi\} \subseteq \lambda.$$

As $\mathrm{otp}(C_\alpha \cap \pi_\alpha(\xi)) = \sup\{\mathrm{otp}(C_\alpha \cap \pi_\alpha(\epsilon)) \mid \epsilon \in \Lambda \cap \xi\}$, and $|\Lambda \cap \xi| < |\Lambda| = \mathrm{cf}(\lambda)$, we infer that $\mathrm{otp}(C_\alpha \cap \pi_\alpha(\xi)) < \lambda$. □

Claim 3.4.3. *For every $\delta < \kappa$, we have $|\{C_\alpha \cap \delta \mid \alpha \in T\}| < \kappa$.*

Proof. Suppose not, and let δ be the least counterexample. Pick a subset $A \subseteq T \setminus (\delta+1)$ of size κ such that:

- $\alpha \mapsto C_\alpha \cap \delta$ is injective over A;
- $\alpha \mapsto \varrho_\alpha \restriction \delta$ is constant over A;
- $\alpha \mapsto \sup\{\xi \in \Lambda \mid \pi_\alpha(\xi) \leq \delta\}$ is constant over A, with value, say, ξ';
- $\alpha \mapsto \pi_\alpha \restriction (\xi'+1)$ is constant over A.[7]

Clearly, $\alpha \mapsto C_\alpha \cap \pi_\alpha(\xi')$ is constant over A. Write $\zeta' := \min(\Lambda \setminus (\xi'+1))$. Then it must be the case that $\alpha \mapsto C_\alpha \cap [\pi_\alpha(\xi'), \delta)$ is injective over A. That is,

$$\alpha \mapsto \overline{[\pi_\alpha(\xi'), \pi_\alpha(\zeta')) \cap (\{\pi_\alpha(\xi')\} \cup \varrho_\alpha^{-1}[\zeta'])} \cap \delta$$

is injective over A, contradicting the fact that the right-hand side of the above mapping is an element of $[\delta]^{<\lambda} \cap V$, and $V \models |[\delta]^{<\lambda}| < \kappa$. □

Since $\mathbb{P}$ is a κ-*cc* notion of forcing, every club $D \subseteq \kappa$ from $V[G]$ contains a club $D' \subseteq D$ from V. Hence, whenever we talk about clubs in κ, we may as well assume that they lie in V.

Claim 3.4.4. *For every cofinal subset $X \subseteq \kappa$ from V, there exists a club $D_X \subseteq \kappa$, such that for every $\alpha \in T \cap D_X$ and every $\sigma < \lambda$, we have $\sup\{\epsilon \in C_\alpha \mid \mathrm{succ}_\sigma(C_\alpha \setminus \epsilon) \subseteq X\} = \alpha$.*

Proof. Work in V. Given a cofinal subset $X \subseteq \kappa$, define $f : \kappa \to \kappa$ by stipulating

$$f(\beta) := \min\{j < \kappa \mid X^j = X \cap \beta \ \&\ j \geq \beta\}.$$

Consider the club $D_X := \{\alpha < \kappa \mid f[\alpha] \subseteq \alpha\} \cap \mathrm{acc}^+(\mathrm{acc}^+(X) \cap T)$. Let $\alpha \in T \cap D_X$ be arbitrary. Let $\tau < \alpha$ and $\sigma < \lambda$ be arbitrary. We shall prove the existence of some $\epsilon \in C_\alpha \setminus \tau$ such that $\mathrm{succ}_\sigma(C_\alpha \setminus \epsilon) \subseteq X$.

[7]Here, we use two facts: (1) If $\pi_\alpha(\xi') \leq \delta$, then $\pi_\alpha \restriction (\xi'+1)$ is the increasing enumeration of an element of $[\delta+1]^{<\lambda} \cap V$. (2) By $V \models |[\delta+1]^{<\lambda}| = \lambda < \kappa$, we have $V[G] \models |[\delta+1]^{<\lambda} \cap V| < \kappa$.

Let $\varrho_\alpha^{-01} : \lambda \to \alpha$ denote a pseudoinverse of the injection $\varrho_\alpha : \alpha \to \lambda$, as follows:

$$\varrho_\alpha^{-01}(\xi) := \begin{cases} \varrho_\alpha^{-1}(\xi), & \text{if } \xi \in \mathrm{Im}(\varrho_\alpha); \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Define $f_0, f_1, f_2, f_3 : \lambda \to \lambda$ by stipulating:

- $f_0(\xi) := \min(\varrho_\alpha[(\mathrm{acc}^+(X) \cap T \cap \alpha) \setminus \pi_\alpha(\xi)])$;
- $f_1(\xi) := \varrho_\alpha(f(\varrho_\alpha^{-01}(\xi)))$;
- $f_2(\xi) := \min\{\zeta < \lambda \mid \varrho_\alpha^{-01}(\xi) \leq \pi_\alpha(\zeta)\}$;
- $f_3(\xi) := \min\{\zeta < \lambda \mid \mathrm{otp}(\varrho_\alpha^{-1}[\zeta] \cap [\pi_\alpha(\xi), \pi_\alpha(\zeta)) \geq \sigma\}$.

f_0 is well-defined since $\alpha \in \mathrm{acc}^+(\mathrm{acc}^+(X) \cap T)$. f_1 is well-defined since $f[\alpha] \subseteq \alpha$. f_2 is well-defined since $\mathrm{Im}(\pi_\alpha)$ is cofinal in α. f_3 is well-defined since $\mathrm{cf}(\alpha) = \lambda$, so that $\mathrm{otp}([\pi_\alpha(\xi), \alpha)) \geq \lambda > \sigma$ for all $\xi < \lambda$.

Define $f_* : \lambda \to \lambda$ by stipulating:

$$f_*(\xi) := \max\{f_0(\xi), f_1(f_0(\xi)), f_2(f_1(f_0(\xi))), f_3(\xi)\}.$$

From now on, work in $V[G]$. By the choice of Λ, pick a large enough $\xi \in \Lambda$ such that $f_*(\xi) < \min(\Lambda \setminus (\xi+1))$ and $\pi_\alpha(\xi) > \tau$. Denote $\zeta := \min(\Lambda \setminus (\xi+1))$. Clearly, $C_\alpha \cap [\pi_\alpha(\xi), \pi_\alpha(\zeta)) = \overline{x}$, where

$$x := [\pi_\alpha(\xi), \pi_\alpha(\zeta)) \cap (\{\pi_\alpha(\xi)\} \cup \varrho_\alpha^{-1}[\zeta]).$$

Put $\zeta_0 := f_0(\xi)$, $\zeta_1 := f_1(\zeta_0)$, $\zeta_2 := f_2(\zeta_1)$, and $\zeta_3 := f_3(\xi)$. Evidently, $\zeta_0, \zeta_1 \in \mathrm{Im}(\varrho_\alpha)$. By $f_*(\xi) < \zeta$, we have $\zeta_i < \zeta$ for all $i < 4$.

Write $\beta := \varrho_\alpha^{-1}(\zeta_0)$, $j := f(\beta)$ and $\gamma := \sup(x \cap \beta)$. Then $\beta \in T$, $j = \varrho_\alpha^{-1}(\zeta_1)$, and $X^j = X \cap \beta$ is a cofinal subset of β. As $\zeta_2 < \zeta$, $\min(x) = \pi_\alpha(\xi) \notin T$ and $\beta \in T \setminus \pi_\alpha(\xi)$, we infer that

$$\tau < \pi_\alpha(\xi) \leq \gamma < \beta \leq j \leq \pi_\alpha(\zeta_2) < \pi_\alpha(\zeta) < \alpha.$$

By $\zeta_0 < \zeta$ and $\zeta_1 < \zeta$, we altogether have $\{\beta, j\} \subseteq x \setminus \{\min(x)\}$. Fix some nonzero $i < \mathrm{otp}(x)$ such that $j = x(i)$. Recalling that $X^j = X \cap \beta$ is a cofinal subset of β, we have:

$$h_{x,\beta}(i) = \{\epsilon_{x,\beta}(i)\} \cup \mathrm{succ}_{\mathrm{otp}(x)}(X \cap \beta \setminus \epsilon_{x,\beta}(i)),$$

where $\mathrm{otp}(h_{x,\beta}(i)) = 1 + \mathrm{otp}(x)$ and $h_{x,\beta}(i) \subseteq (\gamma, \beta)$.

As $f_3(\xi) = \zeta_3 < \zeta$, we have $\mathrm{otp}(x) \geq \sigma$, and so in particular

$$\mathrm{succ}_\sigma(\bigcup \mathrm{Im}(h_{x,\beta}) \setminus \epsilon_{x,\beta}(i)) \subseteq X.$$

As $\beta \in x \cap T$, $\beta \neq \min(x)$, and $\gamma = \sup(x \cap \beta)$, we know that $C_\alpha \cap [\gamma, \beta) = \overline{x} \cap [\gamma, \beta)$ is equal to the ordinal closure of $\bigcup \mathrm{Im}(h_{x,\beta})$. Put $\epsilon := \epsilon_{x,\beta}(i)$. Then $\epsilon \in C_\alpha \cap (\gamma, \beta) \subseteq C_\alpha \setminus \tau$, and $\mathrm{succ}_\sigma(C_\alpha \setminus \epsilon) \subseteq X$, as sought. □

For every $\alpha \in T$, let $C_\alpha^\bullet := \mathrm{Im}(g_\alpha)$, where $g_\alpha : C_\alpha \to \alpha$ is defined by stipulating:

$$g_\alpha(\beta) := \begin{cases} \beta, & \text{if } \beta \in \mathrm{acc}(C_\alpha); \\ \min(Z_\beta \cup \{\beta\}), & \text{if } \beta = \min(C_\alpha); \\ \min((Z_\beta \cup \{\beta\}) \setminus (\sup(C_\alpha \cap \beta) + 1)), & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Note that $C_\alpha^\bullet(i) \leq C_\alpha(i) < C_\alpha^\bullet(i+1)$ for all $i < \mathrm{otp}(C_\alpha)$. So g_α is strictly increasing and continuous, and $C_\alpha^\bullet$ is a club subset of α with $\mathrm{otp}(C_\alpha^\bullet) = \mathrm{otp}(C_\alpha) \leq \lambda$, $\mathrm{acc}(C_\alpha^\bullet) = \mathrm{acc}(C_\alpha)$, and $\mathrm{nacc}(C_\alpha^\bullet) = g_\alpha[\mathrm{nacc}(C_\alpha)]$.

Claim 3.4.5. *For every cofinal subset $A \subseteq \kappa$ (from $V[G]$), there exists a club $E_A \subseteq \kappa$, such that for every $\alpha \in T \cap E_A$ and every $\sigma < \lambda$, we have* $\sup\{\eta \in C_\alpha^\bullet \mid \mathrm{succ}_\sigma(C_\alpha^\bullet \setminus \eta) \subseteq A\} = \alpha$.

Proof. Given a cofinal subset $A \subseteq \kappa$ from $V[G]$, let $X_A \in \mathcal{P}^V(\kappa)$ be given by Claim 3.4.1. In particular, $V \models X_A$ is a stationary subset of κ. As $V[G] \models \mathrm{acc}^+(A)$ is a club in κ, and $V[G]$ is a κ-*cc* forcing extension of V, we may fix some $B \in V$ such that $V \models B$ is a club in κ, and $V[G] \models B \subseteq \mathrm{acc}^+(A)$. Put $X := X_A \cap B$. Then:

(1) $V \models X$ is stationary in κ;
(2) $V[G] \models X \subseteq \{\beta < \kappa \mid Z_\beta = A \cap \beta \text{ is a cofinal subset of } \beta\}$.

Now, let $E_A := D_X$, where D_X is given by Claim 3.4.4. Let $\alpha \in T \cap E_A$ and $\sigma < \lambda$ be arbitrary. Then $\sup\{\epsilon \in C_\alpha \mid \mathrm{succ}_\sigma(C_\alpha \setminus \epsilon) \subseteq X\} = \alpha$. To see that $\sup\{\eta \in C^\bullet_\alpha \mid \mathrm{succ}_\sigma(C^\bullet_\alpha \setminus \eta) \subseteq A\} = \alpha$, let $\tau < \alpha$ be arbitrary. Choose $\epsilon \in C_\alpha$ such that $\mathrm{succ}_\sigma(C_\alpha \setminus \epsilon) \subseteq X$ and $g_\alpha(\epsilon) > \tau$. Let $\eta := g_\alpha(\epsilon)$. To see that $\mathrm{succ}_\sigma(C^\bullet_\alpha \setminus \eta) \subseteq A$, consider an arbitrary $i < \sigma$, and we will show that $(C^\bullet_\alpha \setminus \eta)(i+1) \in A$.

Write $\beta := (C_\alpha \setminus \epsilon)(i+1)$. Then $\beta \in \mathrm{nacc}(C_\alpha)$, and $\beta \in X$, so that $Z_\beta = A \cap \beta$ is a cofinal subset of β, and hence

$$(C^\bullet_\alpha \setminus \eta)(i+1) = g_\alpha(\beta) = \min((Z_\beta \cup \{\beta\}) \setminus (\sup(C_\alpha \cap \beta) + 1)) = \min(A \setminus (\sup(C_\alpha \cap \beta) + 1)) \in A,$$

as required. □

Let $\mathcal{C}^\bullet_0 := \{\emptyset\}$, and $\mathcal{C}^\bullet_{\delta+1} := \{\{\delta\}\}$ for all $\delta < \kappa$. For every $\delta \in T$, let $\mathcal{C}^\bullet_\delta := \{C^\bullet_\delta\}$, and for every $\delta \in \mathrm{acc}(\kappa) \setminus T$, let

$$\mathcal{C}^\bullet_\delta := \{C^\bullet_\alpha \cap \delta \mid \alpha \in T, \sup(C^\bullet_\alpha \cap \delta) = \delta\} \cup \{c \in [\delta]^{<\lambda} \cap V \mid c \text{ is a club in } \delta\}.$$

Claim 3.4.6. *$|\mathcal{C}^\bullet_\delta| < \kappa$ for all $\delta < \kappa$.*

Proof. Suppose not, and let $\delta \in \mathrm{acc}(\kappa) \setminus T$ be a counterexample. As $V \models |[\delta]^{<\lambda}| \leq \lambda < \kappa$, and by Claim 3.4.3, let us pick $\alpha < \alpha'$ both from T and above δ such that $C^\bullet_\alpha \cap \delta \neq C^\bullet_{\alpha'} \cap \delta$, $\sup(C^\bullet_\alpha \cap \delta) = \delta = \sup(C^\bullet_{\alpha'} \cap \delta)$, and $C_\alpha \cap \delta = C_{\alpha'} \cap \delta$. By $\delta \in \mathrm{acc}(C^\bullet_\alpha)$, we have $g_\alpha(\delta) = \delta$, and hence $C^\bullet_\alpha \cap \delta = g_\alpha[\delta]$. Likewise, $C^\bullet_{\alpha'} \cap \delta = g_{\alpha'}[\delta]$. So $g_\alpha \restriction \delta \neq g_{\alpha'} \restriction \delta$, contradicting the fact that $C_\alpha \cap \delta = C_{\alpha'} \cap \delta$. □

Altogether, $\langle \mathcal{C}^\bullet_\delta \mid \delta < \kappa\rangle$ witnesses $\mathrm{P}^*(T, \lambda)$. □

Corollary 3.5. *Suppose that λ is a strongly inaccessible cardinal satisfying $2^\lambda = \lambda^+$.*

If $\mathbb{P}$ is a λ^+-cc notion of forcing of size $\leq 2^\lambda$ that makes λ into a singular cardinal, then $\mathbb{P}$ introduces a free λ^+-Souslin tree.

Proof. By Proposition 3.1, $\mathbb{P} \in \mathbb{C}_\lambda$. By Theorem 3.4, then, in $V^{\mathbb{P}}$, $\mathrm{P}^*(T, \lambda) + \diamondsuit(\lambda^+)$ holds for some stationary subset T of λ^+.

Finally, by [BR16], $\mathrm{P}^*(T, \lambda) + \diamondsuit(\lambda^+)$ entails $\mathrm{P}(\lambda^+, \lambda^+, \sqsubseteq, \lambda^+, \{\lambda^+\}, 2, 1, \mathcal{E}_{\lambda^+})$, which by the arguments of [BR15b, §6] suffices for the construction of a free λ^+-Souslin tree. □

By Theorem 3.4, if $\theta < \lambda = \lambda^{<\lambda}$ are infinite regular cardinals, and CH_λ holds, then $V^{\mathrm{Col}(\theta,\lambda)} \models \mathrm{P}^*(T, \lambda) + \diamondsuit(\kappa)$, where $\kappa := \lambda^+$ and $T := E^\kappa_\lambda$, provided a fact we have already mentioned but did not prove: $\mathrm{Col}(\theta, \lambda) \in \mathbb{C}_\lambda$ in this scenario.

The next proposition shows that moreover $\mathrm{P}^*(T, |\lambda|)$ holds in the extension. A byproduct of its proof, will also establish that indeed $\mathrm{Col}(\theta, \lambda) \in \mathbb{C}_\lambda$.

Proposition 3.6. *Suppose that $\theta < \lambda = \lambda^{<\theta}$ are infinite regular cardinals, and CH_λ holds.*

Let $\kappa := \lambda^+$ and $T := E^\kappa_\lambda$. Then $V^{\mathrm{Col}(\theta,\lambda)} \models \mathrm{P}^*(T, \theta) + \diamondsuit(\kappa)$.

Proof. Work in V. For every nonzero $\alpha < \lambda^+$, fix a surjection $f_\alpha : \lambda \to \alpha$. Work in $V[G]$, where G is $\mathrm{Col}(\theta, \lambda)$-generic. Put $g := \bigcup G$. By genericity, $g : \theta \to \lambda$ is a *shuffling surjection*, that is, it satisfies $|g^{-1}\{\eta\}| = \theta$ for every $\eta < \lambda$.

Note that as $\mathrm{Col}(\theta,\lambda)$ is $(<\theta)$-closed, for every $\alpha\in T$, we have $\theta\leq\mathrm{cf}(\alpha)\leq|\alpha|=|\lambda|=\theta$. That is, $T\subseteq E^\kappa_\theta$. Fix $\alpha\in T$. Put $g_\alpha:=f_\alpha\circ g$. As g is a shuffling surjection, so is $g_\alpha:\theta\to\alpha$. Then, since $\mathrm{cf}(\alpha)=\theta$, we may define a strictly increasing function $h_\alpha:\theta\to\theta$ by recursion:

- $h_\alpha(0):=0$;
- $h_\alpha(i+1):=\min\{k\in(h_\alpha(i),\theta)\mid g_\alpha(k)>g_\alpha(h_\alpha(i))\}$;
- for $i\in\mathrm{acc}(\theta)$, $h_\alpha(i):=\min\{k\in(\sup(\mathrm{Im}(h_\alpha\restriction i)),\theta)\mid g_\alpha(k)=\sup(\mathrm{Im}(g_\alpha\circ(h_\alpha\restriction i)))\}$.

Clearly, $C_\alpha:=\mathrm{Im}(g_\alpha\circ h_\alpha)$ is a subset of α of order-type θ satisfying $\mathrm{acc}^+(C_\alpha)\subseteq C_\alpha$. It follows from the next claim (taking $X:=\kappa$) that C_α is moreover a club in α.

Claim 3.6.1. *For every cofinal subset $X\subseteq\kappa$ from V, every $\alpha\in T\cap\mathrm{acc}^+(X)$, and every $\sigma<\theta$, we have* $\sup\{\epsilon\in C_\alpha\mid\mathrm{succ}_\sigma(C_\alpha\setminus\epsilon)\subseteq X\}=\alpha$.[8]

Proof. Work in V. Let X,α and σ be as in the hypothesis. Let $\varepsilon<\alpha$ be arbitrary.

To run a density argument, let us fix an arbitrary condition $p\in\mathrm{Col}(\theta,\lambda)$. By extending p, we may assume that $\bar\theta:=\mathrm{dom}(p)$ is a nonzero ordinal. Put $p_\alpha:=f_\alpha\circ p$, and let χ be the largest ordinal for which there exists a strictly increasing function $h:\chi\to\bar\theta$ satisfying:

- $h(0)=0$;
- $h(i+1)=\min\{k\in(h(i),\bar\theta)\mid p_\alpha(k)>p_\alpha(h(i))\}$;
- for $i\in\mathrm{acc}(\chi)$, $h(i)=\min\{k\in(\sup(\mathrm{Im}(h\restriction i)),\bar\theta)\mid p_\alpha(k)=\sup(\mathrm{Im}(p_\alpha\circ(h\restriction i)))\}$.

Let $\beta:=\sup(\mathrm{Im}(p_\alpha\circ h))$, and $\epsilon:=\max\{\beta,\varepsilon\}$. As $|\mathrm{Im}(p_\alpha)|\leq|\bar\theta|<\theta=\mathrm{cf}(\alpha)$, we know that $\epsilon<\alpha$. For all $\iota<\theta$, denote $x_\iota:=\{\beta,\varepsilon\}\cup\mathrm{succ}_\iota(X\setminus\epsilon)$.

Pick a large enough $\iota<\theta$ such that $\mathrm{otp}(\mathrm{succ}_\sigma(x_\iota\setminus\epsilon))=\sigma$, and let $\overline{x}$ denote the ordinal closure of x_ι. By $\iota<\theta$ and $\alpha\in\mathrm{acc}^+(X)\cap T$, we have $\overline{x}\subseteq\mathrm{Im}(f_\alpha)$. Pick a condition q extending p, such that $\langle q(k)\mid\bar\theta\leq k<\bar\theta+\mathrm{otp}(\overline{x})\rangle$ forms the increasing enumeration of $\overline{x}$. Then q forces that $\epsilon\in C_\alpha\setminus\varepsilon$ and $\mathrm{succ}_\sigma(C_\alpha\setminus\epsilon)\subseteq X$. □

In V, by CH_λ and the main result of [She10], $\diamondsuit(\kappa)$ holds. By $\lambda^{<\theta}=\lambda<\kappa$, $\mathrm{Col}(\theta,\lambda)$ is a κ-*cc* poset of size $<\kappa$, so that the same argument from the proof of Theorem 3.4 yields that in $V[G]$, there exists a sequence $\langle Z_\alpha\mid\alpha<\kappa\rangle$ satisfying that for every $A\in\mathcal{P}^{V[G]}(\kappa)$, there exists some $X_A\in\mathcal{P}^V(\kappa)$ such that:

(1) $V\models X_A$ is stationary;
(2) $V[G]\models X_A\subseteq\{\beta<\lambda^+\mid Z_\beta=A\cap\beta\}$.

As $(\theta^+)^{V[G]}=(\lambda^+)^V=\kappa$, and as $\mathrm{Col}(\theta,\lambda)$ is a κ-*cc* poset, stationary subsets of κ from V remain stationary in $V[G]$, so that $V[G]\models\diamondsuit(\kappa)$.

Work in $V[G]$. For every $\alpha\in T$, let $C^\bullet_\alpha:=\mathrm{Im}(g_\alpha)$, where $g_\alpha:C_\alpha\to\alpha$ is defined exactly as in the proof of Theorem 3.4 (page 11). Then $C^\bullet_\alpha$ is again a club in α of order-type θ.

Claim 3.6.2. *For every cofinal subset $A\subseteq\kappa$ (from $V[G]$), there exists a club $E_A\subseteq\kappa$, such that for every $\alpha\in T\cap E_A$ and every $\sigma<\theta$, we have* $\sup\{\eta\in C^\bullet_\alpha\mid\mathrm{succ}_\sigma(C^\bullet_\alpha\setminus\eta)\subseteq A\}=\alpha$.

Proof. The result follows from Claim 3.6.1 just like Claim 3.4.5 follows from Claim 3.4.4. □

For every $\alpha\in E^\kappa_\theta\setminus T$, let $C^\bullet_\alpha$ be an arbitrary club subset of α of order-type θ.

[8] Let us point out that C_λ witnesses the crucial reason for $\mathrm{Col}(\theta,\lambda)\in\mathbb{C}_\lambda$. That is, by taking $\Lambda:=C_\lambda$, we get that Λ is a club in λ of order-type $\mathrm{cf}(\lambda)$ such that for every function $f\in{}^\lambda\lambda\cap V$, there exists some $\xi\in\Lambda$ with $f(\xi)<\min(\Lambda\setminus(\xi+1))$. Indeed, given $f\in{}^\lambda\lambda\cap V$, simply pick $X\subseteq\kappa$ from V such that $X\setminus\lambda=\kappa\setminus\lambda$, and such that $X\cap\lambda$ is a cofinal subset of λ satisfying that for all $\xi\in X\cap\lambda$, $f(\xi)<\min(X\setminus(\xi+1))$. Now, appeal to our claim with this X and with $\sigma=3$.

Finally, for every $\alpha<\kappa$, let:

$$\mathcal{C}^\bullet_\alpha := \begin{cases} \{\emptyset\}, & \text{if } \alpha=0;\\ \{\{\beta\}\}, & \text{if } \alpha=\beta+1;\\ \{C^\bullet_\alpha\}, & \text{if } \alpha\in E^\kappa_\theta;\\ \{c\in[\alpha]^{<\theta}\mid c \text{ is a club in } \alpha\}, & \text{otherwise.}\end{cases}$$

As $V\models\lambda^{<\theta}=\lambda$, and $\mathrm{Col}(\theta,\lambda)$ is $(<\theta)$-closed, we have $|[\lambda]^{<\theta}|\leq|\lambda|=\theta$, so that $|\mathcal{C}^\bullet_\alpha|<\kappa$ for all $\alpha\in E^\kappa_{<\theta}$. Altogether, $\langle\mathcal{C}^\bullet_\alpha\mid\alpha<\kappa\rangle$ witnesses $\mathrm{P}^*(T,\theta)$. □

Proposition 3.7. *Suppose that $\lambda^{<\lambda}=\lambda$ is an infinite cardinal, and $\kappa>\lambda$ is a strongly inaccessible cardinal. If $\mathbb{P}$ is a $(<\lambda)$-distributive, κ-cc notion of forcing, collapsing κ to λ^+, then $V^{\mathbb{P}}\models\mathrm{P}^*(E^{\lambda^+}_\lambda,\lambda)+\diamondsuit(\lambda^+)$.*

Proof. As κ is strongly inaccessible, for every $\alpha<\kappa$, the collection $\mathcal{N}_\alpha:=\{\tau\in V_{\alpha+1}\mid\tau\text{ is a }\mathbb{P}\text{-name}\}$ has size $<\kappa$. Let G be $\mathbb{P}$-generic over V, and work in $V[G]$. For every $\mathbb{P}$-name τ, denote by τ_G its interpretation by G. Then, for all $\alpha<\kappa$, let $\mathcal{A}_\alpha:=\{\tau_G\mid\tau\in\mathcal{N}_\alpha\}\cap\mathcal{P}(\alpha)$. Since $\mathbb{P}$ has the κ-cc, $\langle\mathcal{A}_\alpha\mid\alpha<\kappa\rangle$ forms a $\diamondsuit^+(\lambda^+)$-sequence, and in particular, $\diamondsuit^*(E^{\lambda^+}_\lambda)$ and $\diamondsuit(\lambda^+)$ hold. Since $\mathbb{P}$ is $(<\lambda)$-distributive, we still have $\lambda^{<\lambda}=\lambda$. Finally, by [BR16], $\diamondsuit^*(E^{\lambda^+}_\lambda)+\lambda^{<\lambda}=\lambda$ entails $\mathrm{P}^*(E^{\lambda^+}_\lambda,\lambda)$. □

References

[AS83] Uri Abraham and Saharon Shelah. Forcing closed unbounded sets. *J. Symbolic Logic*, 48(3):643–657, 1983.

[AAK16] Domink Adolf, Arthur W. Apter, and Peter Koepke. Singularizing Successor Cardinals by Forcing. *Submitted*, 2016.

[BR15a] Ari Meir Brodsky and Assaf Rinot. A microscopic approach to Souslin-tree constructions. Part I. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1601.01821*, 2015.

[BR15b] Ari Meir Brodsky and Assaf Rinot. Reduced powers of Souslin trees. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1507.05651*, 2015.

[BR16] Ari Meir Brodsky and Assaf Rinot. A microscopic approach to Souslin-tree constructions. Part II. *in preparation*, 2016.

[CFM01] James Cummings, Matthew Foreman, and Menachem Magidor. Squares, scales and stationary reflection. *J. Math. Log.*, 1(1):35–98, 2001.

[CS02] James Cummings and Ernest Schimmerling. Indexed squares. *Israel J. Math.*, 131:61–99, 2002.

[DJ74] Keith J. Devlin and Håvard Johnsbråten. *The Souslin problem*. Lecture Notes in Mathematics, Vol. 405. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1974.

[DS95] Mirna Džamonja and Saharon Shelah. On squares, outside guessing of clubs and $I_{<f}[\lambda]$. *Fund. Math.*, 148(2):165–198, 1995.

[FH16] Laura Fontanella and Yair Hayut. Square and Delta reflection. *Ann. Pure Appl. Logic*, 167(8):663–683, 2016.

[Git95] Moti Gitik. Some results on the nonstationary ideal. *Israel J. Math.*, 92(1-3):61–112, 1995.

[Gre76] John Gregory. Higher Souslin trees and the generalized continuum hypothesis. *J. Symbolic Logic*, 41(3):663–671, 1976.

[Jen72] R. Björn Jensen. The fine structure of the constructible hierarchy. *Ann. Math. Logic*, 4:229–308; erratum, ibid. 4 (1972), 443, 1972. With a section by Jack Silver.

[LH16] Chris Lambie-Hanson. *Aronszajn trees, square principles, and stationary reflection. arXiv preprint arXiv:1605.05489*, 2016.

[Rin09] Assaf Rinot. A cofinality-preserving small forcing may introduce a special Aronszajn tree. *Arch. Math. Logic*, 48(8):817–823, 2009.

[Rin16] Assaf Rinot. Higher Souslin trees and the GCH, revisited. *submitted*, 2016.

[Sch05] Ernest Schimmerling. A question about Suslin trees and the weak square hierarchy. *Notre Dame J. Formal Logic*, 46(3):373–374 (electronic), 2005.

[She10] Saharon Shelah. Diamonds. *Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society*, 138:2151–2161, 2010. arxiv:0711.3030.
[Spe49] E. Specker. Sur un problème de Sikorski. *Colloquium Math.*, 2:9–12, 1949.
[Tod84] S. Todorčević. Trees and linearly ordered sets. In *Handbook of set-theoretic topology*, pages 235–293. North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1984.
[Tod87] Stevo Todorčević. Partitioning pairs of countable ordinals. *Acta Math.*, 159(3-4):261–294, 1987.

Department of Mathematics, Bar-Ilan University, Ramat-Gan 5290002, Israel.
URL: http://u.math.biu.ac.il/~brodska/
URL: http://www.assafrinot.com